

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-17, 19-24 remain pending in this application. Claims 10, 16, 19 and 22 are allowed. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20 and 21 are indicated as rejected. Claims 3, 7, 8, 13 and 18 are objected to. Claims 1, 11, and 17 are amended herein to respectively include the subject matters of claims 3, 13 and 18 which are hereby cancelled. Examination of claims 23 and 24 has not been addressed.

**ADDED CLAIMS NOT EXAMINED**

In the amendment filed June 8, 2005, claim 22-24 were added. Claim 23 and 24 have not been addressed by the Examiner in the present Office Action. The Office Action of February 8, 2005, indicated that claims 3 and 18 contained allowable subject matter and would be allowed if amended to overcome the §112, second paragraph rejection. Applicant further noted that claim 13 was not rejected based on prior art and accordingly submitted that claim 13 included allowable subject matter similar to that of claim 3. The amendment of June 8, 2005, presented the subject matter of claims 3, 13 and 18 and the subject matter of their base claims, as pending at the time, respectively in new independent claims 22, 23 and 24. Applicants respectfully request that

the Examiner review claims 23 and 24 and indicate their allowance in the next Office Action.

If for any reason the Examiner does not consider claims 23 and 24 to be in condition for allowance, applicants' respectfully submit that a further Office Action is warranted in lieu of an advisory action since these claim were not given proper consideration in the present Office Action.

#### **CLAIM 7 REJECTION AND OBJECTION**

Claim 7 is indicated on the Office Action cover sheet as being both rejected and objected to. The DETAILED ACTION does not indicate a basis for rejection of claim 7 but does indicate that claim 7 contains allowable subject but is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, and would be allowed if set in independent form. However, no 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, rejection is set forth in the Office Action. Additionally, claim 7 was and remains in independent form. As such it is respectfully requested that the rejection of and objection to claim 7 be withdrawn and that allowance of claim 7 be indicated.

If for any reason the Examiner does not consider claim 7 to be in condition for allowance, applicants' respectfully submit that a further Office Action is warranted in lieu of an advisory action since a proper basis for rejection of or objection to claim 7 is not set forth in the present Office Action.

**CLAIM 8 OBJECTION**

Claim 8 is indicated in the Office Action as being objected to. The DETAILED ACTION does not indicate a basis for objection to claim 8. The DETAILED ACTION indicates that claim 8 contains allowable subject but is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, and would be allowed if set in independent form. Again, no 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>d</sup> paragraph, rejection is set forth in the Office Action. Additionally, claim 8 was and remains in independent form. As such it is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 8 be withdrawn and that allowance of claim 8 and claim 9 dependent therefrom be indicated.

If for any reason the Examiner does not consider claim 8 to be in condition for allowance, applicants' respectfully submit that a further Office Action is warranted in lieu of an advisory action since a proper basis for rejection of or objection to claim 7 is not set forth in the present Office Action.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 17 and 21 are rejected as obvious over Wagner '957 in view of Christy '552 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 4, 5 and 15 are rejected as obvious over Wagner in view Christy and further in view of Kajihara under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 6 is rejected as obvious over Wagner in view of

Christy and further in view of Doi '982 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverses this rejection.

Of the above noted rejected claims, claims 1, 11 and 17 are independent and the remaining rejected claims variously depend from these independent claims. The Examiner has indicated that claim 3, 13 and 18 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 11 and 17 are amended to respectively include the subject matters of their dependent claims 3, 13 and 18 which are now cancelled.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of all claims and their allowance are respectfully requested.

#### **REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Applicant respectfully requests a two month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. The fee of \$450.00 for the extension is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg  
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants

by and,

By H. F. Ruschmann  
Herbert F. Ruschmann  
Reg. No. 35,341  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038.